From: HOPE Bruce

To: Carrie Smith; Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: Fate and Transport Segment Rationale

Date: 12/04/2006 09:28 AM

OK, I see this. The problem is that on the maps I was using a mileage marker was superimposed on a segment division line (or vice versa) so it wasn't clear that a 400 m long segment was being defined. Aside from splitting the segment, we'd also have to ask Aaron to re-align the sample locations and the City to re-allocate their stormwater model results to this new segment.

----Original Message-----

From: Carrie Smith [mailto:csmith@parametrix.com] Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 9:15 AM To: HOPE Bruce; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov Subject: RE: Fate and Transport Segment Rationale

I took a look, and it appears that in the STELLA model, the segments from 10-10.4 and 9.4-10 have been combined into one segment ("Section B - 10.4 to 9.4)". Not sure at what stage this change was made, but we can un-make it (i.e. split this segment back up into 2), if necessary.

Carrie

>>> "HOPE Bruce" <HOPE.Bruce@deq.state.or.us> 12/04 7:21 AM >>> The only way I can see getting 37 segments is if you allow for 3 more above RM 11 where the maps I was working from stop

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2006 9:40 AM

To: csmith@parametrix.com

Cc: HOPE Bruce

Subject: Fate and Transport Segment Rationale

Carrie, here is something I wrote up earlier this year outlining the rationale for selecting the fate and transport segments. I am a little concerned that this table indicates 37 segments while Bruce keeps talking about 34. Am I missing something here? Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: FateandTransportSections.doc)